UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	X	
JULIUS K. MCINTYRE,	: : :	03-CV-5830 (ARR)(LB)
Plaintiff, -against-	: : :	NOT FOR PRINT OR ELECTRONIC PUBLICATION
MTA NEW YORK CITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY,  Defendant.	· : :	ORDER
ROSS, United States District Judge:	X	

Plaintiff *pro se*, Julius K. McIntyre, filed this employment discrimination action against the New York City Transit Authority on November 17, 2003. Dkt. No. 1. The case was settled and dismissed on July 21, 2004, pursuant to a stipulation whereby plaintiff agreed, <u>inter alia</u>, never again to seek employment with defendant and its affiliated entities. Dkt. Nos. 16, 17. On April 8, 2008, plaintiff moved to vacate the settlement, alleging that he had been "tricked" into signing the stipulation, <u>see</u> Mot. to Vacate at 2-3. He also wished to reapply for employment with defendant. <u>See</u> Dkt. No. 19.

Pending before the court is the Report and Recommendation, dated May 5, 2008, from the Honorable Lois Bloom, United States Magistrate Judge, recommending denial of plaintiff's motion because his most recent assertions are belied by the record of the settlement proceedings over which Judge Bloom presided, and because, in any event, plaintiff failed to meet the requirements of Rule 60(b), Fed. R. Civ. P., necessary to obtain a vacatur of the court's final judgment. See R&R at 2. At the close of the R&R, Judge Bloom instructed plaintiff that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b), Fed. R. Civ. P., he was required to file

any objections to the R&R within ten days from the service of the Report and that failure to file a timely objection generally waives further judicial review.

that he could not find a job, and stated that he "need[ed] help and more time to file confirmations or objections." See Plaintiff's Letter dated 5/13/08 (Dkt. No. 21). Judge Bloom construed the letter as a request for an extension of time to file objections to the R&R, and granted an extension to May 30, 2008, but admonished plaintiff that no further extensions would be permitted. Notwithstanding, Judge Bloom's admonition, plaintiff wrote this court by letter dated May 28, 2008, seeking a further extension of time to file his objections. This court granted the request to June 20, 2008, but advised plaintiff that, should he fail timely to file his objections, the letters he had already submitted to the court would be construed as his objections. See Dkt. No. 23. No further communications have been received from plaintiff. Accordingly, the court construes plaintiff's letters of May 13 and May 28, 2008, as his objections to Judge Bloom's Report and Recommendation.

The substance of plaintiff's objections is that he was tricked into signing the stipulation of settlement in this case. See Letter dated 5/13/08 at 3. He does not allege that defendants failed to meet their obligations under the agreement. Rather, he complains that he now wishes to apply for re-employment by defendant, in contravention of the terms of the settlement agreement. Because, as Judge Bloom concluded, plaintiff's conclusory allegation that he was defrauded into settling the case is flatly belied by the recored, see R&R at 3-4, citing Tran. at 2, 6-7 (Dkt. No. 17), the court finds no merit in plaintiff's objections.

Accordingly, having conducted a de novo review of the record, the court adopts the Report and Recommendation, Dkt. No. 20, as the opinion of the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), and denies plaintiff's motion to vacate the settlement.

SO ORDERED.

/S/
Allyne R. Ross
United States District Judge

Dated: July 3, 2008

Brooklyn, New York

## SERVICE LIST:

Plaintiff Pro Se
Julius McIntyre
889 Putnam Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11221

## Defendants' Attorney

Robert Kenneth Drinan NYC Transit Authority 130 Livingston Street, 12th Floor Brooklyn, NY 11201

cc: Magistrate Judge Bloom